



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,076	11/28/2001	David J. Koenig	1094.199US1	1096

21186 7590 09/09/2004

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

TRAN, DALENA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3661

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/996,076

Applicant(s)

KOENIG ET AL.

Examiner

Dalena Tran

Art Unit

3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This office action response to the letter on 6/7/04 of response to restriction requirement.

Applicant has elect claims 1-6. Claims 1-6 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1, is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Slavik (4,499,385).

As per claim 1, Slavik discloses a power control system for a recreational vehicle comprising: a connector adapted for receiving electrical current from a source of shore power, the connector for connecting the recreational vehicle to the source of shore power (see column 3, line 51 to column 4, line 4). Slavik does not explicitly disclose a sensor for automatically determining the amp service level of the shore power input to the recreational vehicle. However, Slavik discloses in column 4, lines 49-63, a load current sensor (58) coupled to shore power (26) to measure the magnitude of the current flowing between the appliances and shore power and output the load current signal (60) to controller (figure 2), and setting an electrical system not to exceed the sensed amp service level of the shore power (see column 1, line 56 to column 2, line 28; column 5, line 59 to column 6, line 23; and column 10, lines 38-59). It is obvious that the

load current sensor (58) capable of determining the amp service level of the shore power input to the recreational vehicle in order for the controller prevents the current drawn from the power source from exceeding the operative limit as the purpose of Slavik invention (column 2, line 15-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the sensor disclose by Slavik for automatically determining the amp service level of the shore power input to the recreational vehicle in order to protect the vehicle's appliances from damage of exceed current drawn from the limit available of power supply and reduce a blowing of fuses or tripping of circuit breakers associated with an over current condition.

4. Claim 2, is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Slavik (4,499,385) in view of Pressman et al. (5,555,483).

As per claim 2, Slavik does not disclose the amp service level of the shore power is determined by a phase difference between at least two phases of the shore power. However, Pressman et al. disclose the amp service level of the shore power is determined by a phase difference between at least two phases of the shore power (see column 5, lines 40-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Slavik by combining the amp service level of the shore power is determined by a phase difference between at least two phases of the shore power for monitoring the voltage between the two phase line power supply.

5. Claims 3-6, are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Slavik (4,499,385), and Pressman et al. (5,555,483) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Proctor et al. (5,583,413).

Art Unit: 3661

As per claim 3, Slavik, and Pressman et al. do not disclose a rechargeable power source. However, Proctor et al. disclose a rechargeable power source wherein the amount of current used to recharge the rechargeable power source is automatically adjusted based on the amount of available shore or generator power (see column 1, line 57 to column 2, line 37; column 4, line 37 to column 5, line 13; and column 5, line 61 to column 6, line 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Slavik, and Pressman et al. by combining a rechargeable power source to restore the power level for the power control system and can be used by any attached appliances.

Also, as per claims 4 and 6, Proctor et al. disclose the rechargeable power source includes a battery and an inverter (see column 3, lines 18-23).

As per claim 5, Pressman et al. disclose the rechargeable power source includes a capacitor (see column 5, lines 20-25).

Remarks

6. Applicant's election of claims 1-6 filed on 6/7/04 has been considered. The new ground of rejection as above.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dalena Tran whose telephone number is 703-308-8223. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 AM-5:30 PM), off every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on 703-305-8233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3661

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner

Dalena Tran

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Dalena Tran".

September 3, 2004